**Reila Bird-Duesing Chapter 5 & 6 Response May 18th, 2009**

**Part One**:

What is the main purpose of Management-Oriented Evaluation Approaches?

* To inform decision makers about the inputs, processes, and outputs of the program under evaluation.
* Considers the decision maker’s concerns informational needs, and criteria for effectiveness when developing the evaluation.

What are the popular model’s of Management-Oriented Evaluation?

* The CIPP Evaluation model – a decision oriented evaluation approach with four different kinds of decisions (context, input, process, product).
* The UCLA Evaluation model – an evaluation framework which focuses on systems assessment, program planning, program implementation, program improvement, and program certification. (Alkin, 1969)

How is Management-Oriented Evaluation used?

* It has guided program managers through program planning, operation, and review.
* It has been used for accountability purposes.
* Administrators and boards have found it useful in meeting public demands for information.

What are some of the strengths of Management-Oriented Evaluation?

* It gives focus to the evaluation.
* Evaluation can occur while the program is running.
* Most preferred by managers and boards.
* CIPP model is a simple and useful tool that helps generate important questions.
* Supports every component of a program as it operates, grows or changes.
* Stresses the timely use of feedback.

What are some of the limitations of Management-Oriented Evaluation?

* Evaluator’s inability to respond to questions or issues
* Programs that lack decisive leadership are not likely to benefit from this approach.
* Preference given to “top management”; viewed as “hired gun”
* Evaluation can become unfair and possibly even undemocratic.
* Disenfranchises other stakeholders who have less power and resources.
* Can result in costly and complex evaluation.

What is the purpose of Consumer-Orientated Evaluation Approaches?

* Provides potential consumers with information regarding a variety of product factors, helps consumers become more knowledgeable about the products they purchase.

What has Scriven (1967) contributed to Consumer-Orientated Evaluation Approaches?

* Developed criteria for evaluation educational products.
* In 1974 published a product checklist.
* Also developed a Key Evaluation Checklist.

How has Consumer-Orientated Evaluation Approaches been used?

* Used extensively by government agencies and independent educational consumer advocates.

What are some of the strengths of Consumer-Orientated Evaluation Approaches?

* They have made available evaluations of products as a service to those who may not have the time on information to do the job.
* They have increased consumers’ knowledge about the criteria most appropriate to use in selecting educational or service-delivery products.
* Checklists are useful and simple tools
* Consumers are aware and less vulnerable.

What are some of the limitations of Consumer-Orientated Evaluation Approaches?

* Can increase the cost of products.
* Threatens local initiative development.

**Part Two:**

I found the reading this week to be informative and practical. Both the Management-Orientated and the Consumer-Oriented Evaluation Approaches made me realize that evaluation is more than reflecting and gathering data. Each approach is unique in nature, yet both demand a great deal of attention to detail.

With respect to Management-Orientated Evaluations, I can see how the CIPP evaluation model would be the preferred evaluation model for managers and boards. Not only is the CIPP designed to work closely with managers or the “decision makers”, its evaluation framework allows for the evaluation to match the kind of decision that needs to be reached. Thus, the general steps proposed by Stufflebeam (1973a) will be a simple and useful tool for those involved in Management-Oriented evaluations (p.90). I was also surprised to read that the four evaluation types (context, input, process, product) can have a duel role in decision making and accountability. I like the fact that the evaluation can be conducted for formative and summative orientations. This illustrates the diversity and flexibility of this type of evaluation. Additionally, “it provides a record-keeping framework that facilitates public review of client needs, objectives, plans, activities, and outcomes” (p.94). Although I am quite fond of the approach, some concerns were raised as I read about the limitations of the approach. For instance, I wonder why this approach is only designed to focus on the decision managers and does not include all the necessary stakeholders. Is it because the stakeholders are not considered valuable or do not hold any power? Or is it an approach that decision managers prefer because they hold the power to make all of the decisions which will ultimately affect the stakeholders? None the less, “... this approach assumes that the important decisions can be clearly identified in advance, that clear decision alternatives can be specified, and that the decisions to be served remain reasonably stable while the evaluation is being done” (p.96). But, we all know what happens when we make “assumptions”!

With respect to Consumer-Oriented Evaluations, as a consumer (and educator) I am relieved to know that such evaluations exist. I am relieved because there is such an over abundance of educational materials on the market which makes it difficult for educators to “weed” through and decide on what is quality and relevant. Over the past ten years I have been involved in piloting curriculum and resources. For the most part, my involvement has been positive and rewarding. Not only did I play an active role in “test-driving” the material, but I was required to provide feedback back to the Ministry of Education. It is my hope that serious consideration went into evaluating the materials prior to the piloting project. I wonder if Scriven’s (1974b) checklist was used? At first glance Scriven’s’ list is overwhelming, but it has the potential to serve as a valuable tool for many government and educational agencies. I did not realize that evaluating materials was such a lengthy process. Now I am curious about how educational materials are evaluated locally. For example, many (if not all) of the recommended resources in the Saskatchewan curriculum are reviewed by curriculum developers and implementation committees. At the division level, the consultants also act as the vehicle to ensure that the resources end up in our classrooms. Nevertheless, as a result of my positive experiences in piloting curriculum, I am confident that our curriculum developers and school division consultants evaluate and recommend the best possible resources on the market.